UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

United States of America

		V.	ORDER OF DETENTION PENDING TRIAL	
	Ma	rio Lamberto Elenes	Case Number: CR-17-974-01-PHX-DGC	
	l con by cl	clude that the following facts are est ear and convincing evidence the	J.S.C. § 3142(f), a detention hearing has been ablished: <i>(Check one or both, as applicable.)</i> defendant is a danger to the community and	
\boxtimes	•	re the detention of the defendant per preponderance of the evidence to	ending trial in this case. The defendant is a flight risk and require the	
	•	ntion of the defendant pending trial i		
		There is probable cause to believe an offense for which a maximum prescribed in 21 U.S.C. §§ 801 et seq. an offense under 18 U.S.C. §§ 924 an offense listed in 18 U.S.C. § 2332 maximum term of imprisonment of tell an offense involving a minor victim. The defendant has not rebutted the	2b(g)(5)(B) (Federal crimes of terrorism) for which a n years or more is prescribed. In prescribed in Click here to enter text 1 The presumption established by finding 1 that no sions will reasonably assure the appearance of	
Alternative Findings				
	(1)	There is a serious risk that the deconditions will reasonably assure to	fendant will flee; no condition or combination of the appearance of the defendant as required.	
	(2)	No condition or combination of cothers and the community.	onditions will reasonably assure the safety of	
	(3)		defendant will obstruct or attempt to obstruct idate a prospective witness or juror.	

PART II -- WRITTEN STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR DETENTION

(Check one or both, as applicable.)

	(1)	I find that the credible testimony and information submitted at the hearing establishes by clear and convincing evidence as to danger that:		
⊠	(2) □	I find by a preponderance of the evidence as to risk of flight that: The defendant has no significant contacts in the District of Arizona.		
		The defendant has no resources in the United States from which he/she might make a bond reasonably calculated to assure his/her future appearance.		
	\boxtimes	The defendant has a prior criminal history.		
	\boxtimes	There is a record of prior failure to appear in court as ordered.		
		The defendant attempted to evade law enforcement contact by fleeing from law enforcement.		
		The defendant is facing a minimum mandatory of incarceration and a maximum of		
		defendant does not dispute the information contained in the Pretrial Services ort, except:		
\boxtimes	In addition:			
	histo	endant is on felony probation in Maricopa County. Defendant has serious criminal bry. Defendant has prior probation revocations, and has served terms of isonment for felony weapon possession and Aggravated Assault.		

The Court incorporates by reference the findings in the Pretrial Services Report which were reviewed by the Court at the time of the hearing in this matter.

PART III -- DIRECTIONS REGARDING DETENTION

The defendant is committed to the custody of the Attorney General or his/her designated representative for confinement in a corrections facility separate, to the extent practicable, from persons awaiting or serving sentences or being held in custody pending appeal. The defendant shall be afforded a reasonable opportunity for private consultation with defense counsel. On order of a court of the United States or on request of an attorney for the Government, the person in charge of the corrections facility shall deliver the defendant

to the United States Marshal for the purpose of an appearance in connection with a court proceeding.

PART IV -- APPEALS AND THIRD PARTY RELEASE

IT IS ORDERED that should an appeal of this detention order be filed with the District Court, it is counsel's responsibility to deliver a copy of the motion for review/reconsideration to Pretrial Services at least one day prior to the hearing set before the District Judge. Pursuant to Rule 59, FED.R.CRIM.P., Defendant shall have fourteen (14) days from the date of service of a copy of this order or after the oral order is stated on the record within which to file specific written objections with the District Court. Failure to timely file objections may waive the right to review. See Rule 59, FED.R.CRIM.P.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that if a release to a third party is to be considered, it is counsel's responsibility to notify Pretrial Services sufficiently in advance of the hearing before the District Judge to allow Pretrial Services an opportunity to interview and investigate the potential third party custodian.

Dated this 8th day of August, 2017.

Honorable John Z. Boyle United States Magistrate Judge